

Keith L. Slenkovich (SBN 129793)  
Keith.Slenkovich@wilmerhale.com  
Joseph F. Haag (SBN 248749)  
Joseph.Haag@wilmerhale.com  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
950 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
Telephone: (650) 858-6000  
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

William F. Lee (*pro hac vice*)  
William.Lee@wilmerhale.com  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 526-6000  
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

James M. Dowd (SBN 259578)  
James.Dowd@wilmerhale.com  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
350 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 443-5300  
Facsimile: (213) 443-5400

*Attorneys for Plaintiff MEDIATEK INC.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

MEDIATEK INC.

Plaintiff,

V.

FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 4:11-cv-05341 (YGB)

**DECLARATION OF  
MH SHIEH IN SUPPORT OF  
FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR  
INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION  
TO FILE UNDER SEAL.**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 I, MH Shieh, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an employee of MediaTek Inc. ("MediaTek"), plaintiff in the above-  
3 captioned matter. My current job title is Special Assistant to the General Manager. I submit this  
4 declaration in support of Freescale Semiconductor Inc.'s ("Freescale") Stipulated Administrative  
5 Motion to File Documents Under Seal ("Administrative Motion") (Dkt. No. 403) pursuant to  
6 Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration  
7 and, if called to testify as a witness, could and would do so competently.

8 2. Freescale's Administrative Motion seeks to have filed under seal confidential,  
9 unredacted versions of Exhibits 1, 10, 35, 38, and 40 to the Declaration of Joshua A. Hartman In  
10 Support of Freescale's Opposition to MediaTek's Motions *in Limine*. (Dkt. No. 404-1.)  
11 Hartman Exhibits 1, 10, 35, 38, and 40 contain excerpts of MediaTek's damages expert report  
12 (Lawton Report) including information regarding the development of a product that has yet to be  
13 released and documents concerning MediaTek's acquisition of the patents-in-suit, including the  
14 purchase and sale agreements.

15 3. MediaTek does not publicly disclose information concerning the development of  
16 its products, particularly those products that have yet to be released. Instead, MediaTek protects  
17 this information as a trade secret, and takes steps to ensure that this information remains  
18 confidential, including marking the information included in Hartman Exhibit 1 (excerpts from  
19 the Lawton Report) as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" when  
20 MediaTek produced this information in this action. If this information were publicly disclosed,  
21 MediaTek's competitors could use the information in Hartman Exhibit 1 to MediaTek's  
22 economic disadvantage by designing their own competing processors to target similar product  
23 markets and customers. Therefore, the requested relief is necessary to protect MediaTek from  
24 such competitive harm.

25 4. MediaTek does not publicly disclose information concerning its patent  
26 acquisitions. Instead, MediaTek protects this information as a trade secret, and takes steps to  
27 ensure that this information remains confidential, including marking the information included in

1 Hartman Exhibits 10, 35, 38, and 40 as "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS' EYES  
2 ONLY" when MediaTek produced this information in this action. If this information were  
3 publicly disclosed, MediaTek's competitors could use the information in Freescale's Corrected  
4 Motion to MediaTek's economic disadvantage by tailoring their negotiation strategies regarding  
5 intellectual property transfers and licensing to exploit MediaTek's practices. Therefore, the  
6 requested relief is necessary to protect MediaTek from such competitive harm.

7 5. The requested relief is narrowly tailored to protect the confidentiality of this  
8 information. Only those portions of Hartman Exhibits 1, 20, 35, 38, and 40 that describe the  
9 development of the yet-to-be-released MediaTek processor and MediaTek's practices regarding  
10 patent acquisitions and licensing are covered by Freescale's Administrative Motion.

11 6. I understand that Freescale's Administrative Motion was filed on January 29,  
12 2014 and that the Court's rules require MediaTek to file a supporting declaration within four  
13 days or by February 3, 2014. Due to the national Chinese New Year holiday, MediaTek's  
14 offices in Taiwan were closed from January 30, 2014 through February 4, 2014. I was therefore  
15 not aware of the need for this declaration until after I returned to work from the holiday.

16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is  
17 true and correct.

19 Dated: February 5, 2014

21 Meng-Hann Shieh

22 MH Shieh